DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 220 UD 028 593

AUTHOR Okamura, Jonathan Y.
TITLE Ethnicity and Stratification in Hawaii. Operation Manong Resource Papers No. 1.
INSTITUTION Hawaii Univ., Manoa. Office of Student Affairs.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 15p.
AVAILABLE FROM Resource Papers, Operation Manong, East-West Road 1, Room 2D, Honolulu, HI 96822 (free).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affirmative Action; Blacks; Chinese Americans; *College Students; Compensatory Education; *Educationally Disadvantaged; *Ethnic Groups; *Ethnicity; Hawaiians; Higher Education; Japanese Americans; Korean Americans; Samoan Americans; Social Status; *Social Stratification; Whites
IDENTIFIERS Filipinos; *Hawaii; *University of Hawaii Manoa

ABSTRACT

Operation Manong (OM) is a program of the University of Hawaii at Manoa that assists students who are considered to be underrepresented at the university to gain entrance and to graduate from the Manoa campus. Papers in this series are training materials for OM and are also a link between the university and the larger community. The analysis of the social stratification system of Hawaii begun in a previous paper is extended using data provided by the 1980 Census. Three objective indices of socioeconomic status (occupational distribution, educational achievement, and income) are used to determine the relative social statuses of ethnic groups in Hawaii. The ethnic groups can be ranked in an overall socioeconomic stratification order. Chinese Americans occupy the upper levels, with Whites also enjoying high social status. Japanese Americans and Korean Americans hold an intermediate position, as do Blacks. At the lower end of the social stratification scale are Filipinos, Native Hawaiians, and Samoan Americans. Given the rigidity of this stratification, subordinate ethnic groups have viewed political processes as a more likely means of mobility than economic opportunities. Social status advancement through access to political power is a lengthy and arduous process, which is made more difficult by the lack of economic resources. The resistance to change in Hawaii is detrimental to more than one-third of the population. Three tables present population data, and there is an eight-item list of references. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED347220

Operation Manong Resource Papers No. 1

ETHNICITY AND STRATIFICATION IN HAWAII

Jonathan Y. Okamura

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Bautista
Operation Manong
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Operation Manong
Office of Student Affairs
University of Hawaii at Manoa

UD 028 593

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Operation Manong Resource Papers

Operation Manong (OM) is a program under the Office of Student Affairs at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. OM's goals are to assist students considered underrepresented at UH-Manoa gain entrance to and graduate from the Manoa campus. Its services include tutoring in the public schools, recruitment and retention activities, and early intervention projects.

The Operation Manong Resource Papers were originally conceived as training material for OM's student employees as well as being a link between the university and the larger community. It is hoped that by making current research and other readings concerning minorities in Hawaii available to the community greater dialogue between the university and the community may be encouraged.

The Resource Papers are available free of charge by sending your request to: Operation Manong, East-West Road 4, Room 2D, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822, Attn: Resource Papers.

Copyright © 1990 Operation Manong, East-West Road 4, Rm. 2D, Honolulu, HI 96822.
Office of Student Affairs, University of Hawaii at Manoa.

ETHNICITY AND STRATIFICATION IN HAWAII

Jonathan Y. Okamura

In a previous paper (Okamura 1982), I compared the relative socioeconomic statuses of various ethnic groups in Hawaii (Chinese, Filipinos, Native Hawaiians, Japanese, Koreans and Whites) in 1970 according to the objective criteria of occupational status, educational attainment, and individual and family income levels. I also considered the patterns of occupational mobility of those groups between 1930 and 1970. Those comparisons indicated the significance of ethnicity as a primary structural principle in regulating the distribution of socioeconomic advantages, opportunities, and rewards among ethnic groups in Hawaii.

I therefore contended that institutionalized inequality among ethnic groups over time or at any moment in time, in the sense that differential access to socioeconomic positions has prevailed and continues to prevail, is a fundamental condition of the social stratification system of Hawaii society. However, it was evident from the diachronic data on occupational status between 1930 and 1970 that the stratification order in Hawaii has allowed for a considerable degree of upward social mobility for particular ethnic groups. Thus, it was concluded that ethnic ascription and competitive achievement are concurrent principles of socioeconomic status allocation in Hawaii society (Okamura 1982, 225).

In the present paper the analysis of the social stratification system of Hawaii is extended using data provided by the 1980 United States census of population for Hawaii. The same three objective indices of socioeconomic status (i.e., occupational distribution, educational achievement and income) will be focused on to determine the relative social statuses of ethnic groups in Hawaii. In addition to the groups considered in the previous paper, the present analysis includes two more ethnic groups: Blacks and Samoans.

The primary objective of this continued analysis is to determine the analytic validity of the two principles of stratification specified previously (ascription of status by ethnicity and achievement of status by competition). Another objective is to ascertain the relative significance for status allocation of those two principles, that is, if they are of equivalent relevance or if one or the other of the principles is of greater consequence. Since this paper is concerned with determining the relation between status differences and ethnic differences in Hawaii, it is first necessary to specify how the terms stratification and ethnicity are understood.

Stratification and Ethnicity

Stratification is commonly defined as an evaluative ranking of social units of a common society that is evident in the differential distribution of benefits, advantages and opportunities among those units. Since such evaluative rankings are institutionalized within the society, they are based on underlying structural principles that regulate the distribution of resources and rewards. Thus, Smith (1975a, 140) maintains stratification does not consist in the mere existence of differential statuses but in the principles by which the distribution of such statuses are organized. As he states,

> Inequalities in the distribution of social assets, opportunities and values are thus central to stratification; but the concrete empirical distribution of these inequalities presupposes some principle or principles to regulate, integrate and order the differentiation. Analytically, then,

the stratification can be reduced to a set of specific principles that generate and organize the prevailing distribution of resources and opportunities (Smith 1975b, 272).

As for *ethnicity,* for the purposes of this paper, it is understood to be such a principle of stratification as described above that regulates status allocation among social units. In more general terms, following Mitchell (1974, 15), as a structural principle, ethnicity is viewed as an analytical concept that can be used to provide an explanation of empirically observed social relations. Ethnicity is thus an emergent property "of the perceptions and actions of actors which the analyst finds convenient to use as a general explanation for a specified class of phenomenon" (Mitchell 1974, 27). In the present study, ethnicity is used to explain the stratification of ethnic groups in Hawaii.

TABLE 1
Population of Hawaii by Ethnicity, 1980 and 1982

	1980		1982	
ETHNIC GROUP	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White	318,770	33.0	244,236	25.5
Japanese	239,748	24.9	213,371	22.3
Filipino	133,940	13.9	113,217	11.8
Hawaiian	115,500	12.0	182,870	19.1
Chinese	56,285	5.8	42,555	4.5
Korean	17,962	1.9	17,460	1.8
Black	17,364	1.8	9,897	1.0
Samoan	14,073	1.5	12,556	1.3
Vietnamese	3,463	0.4		
American Indian	2,655	0.3		
Other	44,931[a]	4.7	12,745[b]	1.3
Puerto Rican			6,891	0.7
Mixed Non-Hawaiian			100,319	10.5
TOTAL	964,691	100.2	956,118	99.8

[a] including Eskimos, Aleuts, Asian Indians, and Guamanians
[b] unmixed or unknown

Sources: 1980 data from **General Population Characteristics, Hawaii,** United States Bureau of the Census.
1982 data from **The State of Hawaii Data Book, 1983,** Hawaii State Department of Planning and Economic Development.

Before proceeding to the discussion of the social stratification system, the substantial ethnic diversity of Hawaii's population can be noted in Table 1. The 1980 data are from the United States census of that year, while the 1982 data come from a survey of the Hawaii State Department of Health (Hawaii State Department of Planning and Economic Development 1983, 39). It is evident the figures for certain ethnic groups, for example, Whites and Native Hawaiians, differ markedly in the two sets of data. Variations in numbers and percentages of ethnic groups are due to the differences in ethnic categories and principles of classification used by the U.S. Bureau of the Census and by the Hawaii Department of Health.

In the 1980 U.S. census, individuals are classified into *unmixed* groups according to self-identification or, alternatively, ethnic identity of the mother. On the other hand, the Department of Health survey includes *mixed* categories such as *Part-Hawaiian* which are comprised of all individuals of Native Hawaiian descent of whatever degree. This difference in classification accounts for the greater number of Hawaiians and perhaps for the lesser numbers of Whites, Filipinos and Chinese in the Department

of Health survey since the latter groups have or have had significant rates of intermarriage with Native Hawaiians.

Occupational Status

Table 2 denotes the scope of occupational distribution for each ethnic group in terms of the percentage of its workers employed in each occupational category. The column labeled *Total* represents the

TABLE 2
Occupational Distribution Within Ethnic Groups in Hawaii, 1980

OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY	Total	Black	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	Japanese	Korean	Samoan	White
Professional Specialty									
Males	10.5	9.9	14.5	2.6	5.7	10.3	11.2	4.7	15.3
Females	13.3	9.9	14.8	5.9	8.7	14.3	6.1	10.5	18.0
Executive, Administrative, and Managerial									
Males	14.1	12.4	17.7	4.6	8.7	15.6	16.0	4.3	18.6
Females	8.9	9.6	12.0	4.5	8.4	8.4	9.1	3.8	11.2
Technical, Sales, and Administrative Support									
Males	19.3	21.3	24.9	12.3	12.7	23.6	22.1	10.8	20.1
Females	46.9	50.9	48.1	37.3	42.6	51.7	37.5	36.0	48.0
Precision Production,Craft, and Repair									
Males	19.6	14.8	13.3	19.1	19.8	23.9	19.8	16.1	17.2
Females	2.1	1.9	2.0	2.6	1.2	2.8	1.7	4.3	1.4
Operators, Fabricators, and Laborers									
Males	17.0	19.0	11.3	28.0	28.6	13.1	13.5	34.5	12.4
Females	5.3	3.1	4.1	11.9	7.9	4.7	3.2	10.1	2.5
Service									
Males	14.4	20.6	16.8	22.0	17.7	9.9	14.8	24.7	12.5
Females	22.0	24.6	18.7	33.1	29.8	16.9	41.9	34.7	18.1
Farm Work and Related Occupations									
Males	3.9	2.1	0.9	10.7	5.8	1.9	1.9	3.6	2.7
Females	1.2	0.0	0.1	4.5	1.1	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.5

Source: **General Social and Economic Characteristics, Hawaii**, United States Bureau of the Census 1982.

occupational profile for all of Hawaii's residents and can serve as an *average* index of male and female workers in the state. It first might be noted that between 1970 and 1980 there was an increase of 56,000 employed males in Hawaii. The largest increases were in the occupational categories of service work of more than 15,000 workers, clerical and sales work of about 14,000 workers (not including technical workers who were included with professions in 1970), and in administration of some 12,000 workers. Overall, there were no major changes in the occupational distribution of males between 1970 and 1980, although the percentage of craft workers declined by about five percentage points and of operators and laborers by about four percentage points, while the proportion of service workers increased by four percentage points. Hawaii males have their greatest representation in precision production, craft and repair (from hereon referred to as *craft*) work (19.6%) and in technical, sales and administrative support (from hereon referred to as *technical and clerical*) occupations (19.3%). In 1970 a plurality of

Hawaii males also was employed in craft work (24.8%), followed by operatives and laborers (20.9%) as the next highest male occupational category.

Among Hawaii females between 1970 and 1980, there was an increase of 73,000 employed. The largest numerical increase in an occupational category was in clerical and sales work of 35,000 workers, although the proportion of those workers increased by less than two percentage points. While there was also a gain of more than 15,000 service workers, the proportion of service workers actually declined by one percent between 1970 and 1980. As was the case with males, there was little overall change in the occupational distribution of females except for a four point increase in the percentage of administrators. As for Hawaii females in 1980, a clear plurality was employed in technical and clerical work (46.9%), while the second highest category of female employment was service work (22.0%). Together, those two occupational grades account for almost 70 percent of female workers in Hawaii, as was also true in 1970. The substantial increase in the numbers of both male and female service and sales workers between 1970 and 1980 indicates Hawaii's growing dependence on the tourist industry.

Reviewing the occupational distribution of ethnic groups, it is evident from Table 2 that in the professions White males and females and Chinese males exceed the corresponding percentages for all males and females in Hawaii. In contrast, Filipino, Native Hawaiian and Samoan males and females, and Black and Korean females are below their respective figures for Hawaii males and females.

In executive, administrative and managerial (from hereon referred to as *administrative*) occupations, the percentages of Chinese and White males and females are greater than those for all males and females in Hawaii. Again, Filipino and Samoan males and females and Native Hawaiian males are below the corresponding figures for Hawaii males and females. On the other hand, both sexes of Blacks, Japanese and Koreans approximate the percentages of their male and female Hawaii counterparts.

In technical and clerical work, male and female Filipinos and Samoans, male Native Hawaiians, and female Koreans are represented in lesser number than all males and females in Hawaii. On the other hand, Chinese and Japanese males exceed the figure for all males. The percentages of both sexes of Blacks and Whites and of Chinese, Native Hawaiian and Japanese females approach their respective figures for Hawaii males and females.

Among male craft workers, the percentages of most of the ethnic groups approximate that for Hawaii males, except those of Blacks and Chinese, which are below, and that for Japanese, which is above the Hawaii figure. Craft work does not comprise a significant proportion of the female work force for most of the ethnic groups.

With regard to operators, fabricators and laborers (from hereon referred to as *operators and laborers*), both sexes of Filipinos, Native Hawaiians, and Samoans exceed the corresponding percentages of Hawaii males and females. In contrast, Chinese, Korean, and White males and females and Japanese males have lower figures than those of their male and female Hawaii counterparts.

A similar situation obtains in service work. Both sexes of Filipinos, Hawaiians and Samoans, Korean females, and Black males have higher percentages than the corresponding figures of Hawaii males and females. On the other hand, Japanese males and females are below the figures for all males and females, while both sexes of Chinese and Whites and Black females approximate their respective percentages of Hawaii males and females.

In summary, the above review of occupational distribution within ethnic groups gives some indication of the relative occupational statuses of those groups. Chinese and Whites have greater proportions of their employed in the upper levels of the occupational scale (professions and administration) than do the other ethnic groups in Hawaii. In particular, Filipinos, Native Hawaiians and Samoans have much smaller percentages of their workers in those two occupational categories as well as in technical and clerical work than do Chinese and Whites. On the other hand, the former groups have much greater percentages of their employed in the lower occupational levels, as operators and

laborers, as service workers, and as farm workers (Filipinos and Native Hawaiians only), than do Chinese and Whites. As for the midrange of the occupational scale, Japanese, Koreans and Blacks occupy an intermediate position between, on the one hand, Chinese and Whites, and on the other, Filipinos, Native Hawaiians and Samoans, due to their general approximation to the overall employment percentages of Hawaii males and females, particularly in white collar occupations, i.e., in the professions, administration, and technical and clerical work.

Besides consideration of the scope of occupational distribution within an ethnic group, another way to evaluate employment data is to determine the percentages of each occupational category held by each ethnic group. Comparison can then be made of the representation of an ethnic group in an occupational grade relative to its proportion of the total labor force. By this means, some indication of the overrepresentation or underrepresentation of a group in the various occupations can be obtained. Since the federal government uses a twenty percent margin of underrepresentation to determine which

TABLE 3

Occupational Distribution in Hawaii by Ethnicity and Sex, 1980

	Black	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	Japanese	Korean	Samoan	White
LABOR FORCE (%)								
Males	0.8	6.9	13.8	10.9	30.8	1.7	0.9	31.1
Females	0.7	6.8	13.1	10.6	33.4	2.4	0.7	29.8
OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY								
Professional Specialty								
Males	0.8	9.5**	3.4*	6.0*	30.2	1.8	0.4*	45.4**
Females	0.5*	7.5	5.8*	6.9*	35.8	1.1*	0.5*	40.2**
Executive, Administrative, and Managerial								
Males	0.7	8.6**	4.5*	6.7*	34.1	2.0	0.3*	41.1**
Females	0.8	9.1**	6.6*	10.0	31.6	2.4	0.3*	37.5**
Technical, Sales, and Administrative Support								
Males	0.9	8.9**	8.8*	7.2*	37.5**	2.0	0.5*	32.3
Females	0.8	7.0	10.4*	9.6	36.9	1.9*	0.5*	30.5
Precision Production, Craft, and Repair								
Males	0.6*	4.7*	13.4	11.0	37.5**	1.7	0.7*	27.2
Females	0.6	6.5	16.7**	6.2*	44.8**	1.9*	1.4**	20.4*
Operators, Fabricators, and Laborers								
Males	0.9	4.6*	22.8**	18.4**	23.8*	1.4	1.8**	22.7*
Females	0.4*	5.2*	29.1**	15.7**	29.7	1.4*	1.3**	14.2*
Service								
Males	1.2**	8.0	21.1**	13.4**	21.2*	1.8	1.5**	27.0
Females	0.8	5.8	19.8**	14.3**	25.7*	4.5**	1.1**	24.5
Farm Work and Related Occupations								
Males	0.4*	1.7*	38.2**	16.4**	14.8*	0.8*	0.8	22.2*
Females	0.0*	0.8*	50.8**	9.8	20.8*	1.0*	0.4*	13.6*

* Underrepresented, ** Overrepresented

Source: **General Social and Economic Characteristics, Hawaii,** United States Bureau of the Census 1982.

ethnic or other social groups require affirmative action to increase their representation in a particular work force, that figure is used to determine cases of both over- and underrepresentation of ethnic groups in the occupational status order.

It is evident from Table 3 that both Chinese males and females are overrepresented in administrative occupations, and males also are excessively represented in the professions and in technical and clerical work. On the other hand, Chinese males and females are underrepresented as operators and laborers and as farm workers, and males only are represented below parity as craft workers. This occupational profile is very similar to that of Chinese in 1970 (Okamura 1982, 220). In that year, Chinese males were overrepresented as white collar workers, that is , as professionals, as administrators, and as clerical and sales workers, while they were underrepresented in blue collar work as craftsmen, as operators and laborers, and as farm laborers and farm foremen. In 1970 Chinese females were proportionally represented in most occupational categories except for their underrepresentation in the lowest occupational grades as farm laborers and as service workers.

Similarly, White males and females are excessively represented in the upper levels of the occupational scale as professionals and as administrators. However, they are both represented below parity as operators and laborers and as farm workers, and females alone are underrepresented as craft workers. In 1970 Whites had a virtually identical occupational distribution as in 1980; both males and females were overrepresented in the professions and in administration, while they were underrepresented in farm work, and females were underrepresented as craft workers and as operators and laborers (Okamura 1982, 220).

In contrast to Chinese and Whites, both sexes of Japanese are proportionally represented as professionals and as administrators in their respective work forces. However, Japanese males are represented above parity in the midrange of the occupational scale as technical and clerical workers and as craft workers, while Japanese females also are overrepresented in the latter category. On the other hand, Japanese males and females are represented below parity as farm and service workers, and males only are underrepresented as operators and laborers. In 1970 Japanese males had a very similar occupational structure as in 1980. They were again represented at parity in the professions and in administration, while they were overrepresented in clerical and sales work and in craft work, and they were underrepresented in farm and in service work. On the other hand, Japanese females were proportionally represented in all occupational categories in 1970 (Okamura 1982, 220).

As for Koreans, males are represented at parity in all occupational categories except farm work, where they are underrepresented. Females are very much overrepresented in service work which may account for their underrepresentation in most of the other occupational grades. Unfortunately, the 1970 U.S. census did not tabulate separate figures on the occupational distribution of Koreans in Hawaii so a comparison with data from that year cannot be made.

Since the proportion of Blacks in the labor force in Hawaii is relatively small in comparison to the other ethnic groups, any interpretation as to their occupational over- or underrepresentation should be made with caution. At any rate, it appears that males are proportionally represented in most occupational categories with the exception of their overrepresentation in service work and their underrepresentation in craft and farm work. Females also are proportionally represented in most occupations except for their underrepresentation as professionals, as operators and laborers, and as farm workers. In 1970 the percentage of Blacks in Hawaii's labor force (0.4% for both sexes) was even smaller than in 1980, so again, some caution is warranted in interpretation of their employment data. Nonetheless, it would seem that males were overrepresented again as service workers, while they were underrepresented as administrators and as farm workers. Females appeared to be excessively represented as professionals, while they were represented below parity as administrators and as craft and farm workers.

In contrast to the above ethnic groups that dominate the upper and middle levels of the occupational scale, Native Hawaiian males and females are underrepresented as professionals, and males also are insufficiently represented as administrators and as technical and clerical workers. However, both

males and females are overly represented at the lower end of the occupational scale as operators and laborers and as service workers, and males also are overrepresented as farm workers. The 1970 U.S. census did not publish occupational data on Hawaiians; however, data from the Hawaii Health Surveillance Program Survey, 1969-1972 (Okamura 1982, 219), denote a very similar occupational distribution for them.

Both Filipino males and females are very much underrepresented in the higher levels of the occupational hierarchy in professional, in administrative, and in technical and clerical work. In contrast, they are heavily overrepresented in the lower occupational categories as craft workers (females only), as operators and laborers, as service workers, and as farm workers. Both sexes of Filipinos had virtually identical occupational profiles in 1970 as in 1980 (Okamura 1982, 220). In the former year, both males and females were represented below parity as professionals, as administrators, and as clerical and sales workers, while they were excessively represented as operators and laborers, as service workers, and as farm workers and foremen. Filipinos were proportionally represented only as craft workers in 1970.

As is the case with Blacks, the Samoan percentages of the male and female labor forces in Hawaii are diminutive in comparison with those of the other ethnic groups. At any rate, it appears male and female Samoans are underrepresented in the three uppermost levels of the occupational scale, while they are overrepresented in two of the lower occupational categories as operators and laborers and as service workers. Males also are represented below parity in craft work, while females are represented above parity in the same category. The U.S. census did not compute separate occupational data on Samoans in Hawaii in 1970.

With the above data, ethnic groups in Hawaii can be ranked according to their relative occupational statuses. At the top of the occupational stratification order would be Chinese and Whites who are both overrepresented in the uppermost levels of the occupational scale in professional and in administrative work. Japanese have an intermediate position in the occupational status hierarchy because of their domination of technical and clerical occupations and of craft work and their proportional representation in the higher occupational grades. Koreans and Blacks also may be placed in the middle level of the occupational status order. On the other hand, Native Hawaiians, Filipinos and Samoans occupy the lower end of the occupational stratification scale due to their collective overrepresentation in the lower occupational categories as operators and laborers, as service workers, and as farm workers, and to their underrepresentation in the higher occupational levels.

It also is evident, between 1970 and 1980, there was not much change in the occupational profiles of individual ethnic groups in terms of their representation in the various occupational categories. Thus, it can be stated, since 1970 there was no significant change in the overall occupational status order in Hawaii in terms of the relative positions of ethnic groups. In 1970 Whites and Chinese again dominated the uppermost occupational levels, Japanese, Koreans and Blacks held intermediate statuses, and Native Hawaiians and Filipinos were relegated to the lowest levels of the occupational hierarchy (Okamura 1982, 219). This congruence between the stratification order in 1970 and 1980 validates, at least for occupational status, the relevance of the two stratification principles, that is , ethnic ascription and competitive achievement, that were advanced in the earlier analysis of the social status system of Hawaii (Okamura 1982, 225). However, the similarity in the occupational rank ordering of ethnic groups in 1970 and 1980 also reflects the lack of upward social mobility on the part of the subordinate groups during that period and thus the lesser significance of achievement of status by competition.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Income

Although income is a direct benefit of employment, a different rank order than that for occupational status obtains among the ethnic groups. In 1979 among males, fifteen years old and over with income, Japanese had the highest median income ($14,597), followed by Chinese ($13,915), Koreans ($11,535), Whites ($11,444), Native Hawaiians ($11,054), Filipinos ($9,511), Samoans ($7,577), and Blacks ($6,879). The median income for Hawaii males was $11,505. Among females, fifteen years old and over with income, a somewhat similar series obtains. Japanese ($7,756) were again first, followed by Chinese ($7,229), Whites ($6,388), Filipinos ($6,200), Koreans ($6,058), Native Hawaiians ($5,714), Blacks ($5,709), and Samoans ($4,516). Hawaii females had a median income of $6,581.

As for median family income, the rank order of ethnic groups is very similar to that for females. That is, Japanese are foremost ($29,215), then Chinese ($28,433), Whites ($20,792), Filipinos ($20,519), Native Hawaiians ($19,824), Koreans ($19,463), Blacks ($12,764), and Samoans ($10,622). Only Japanese and Chinese are above the median family income level for Hawaii residents ($22,750).

According to our three measures of income, it is clear that Japanese and Chinese are at the apex of this status scale. They are the only two groups that are consistently above the median income levels for Hawaii males, females, and families. Although Japanese have a midlevel occupational status, their older median age (35.6 years) compared to the other ethnic groups, which is seven years greater than the median for Hawaii as a whole, is a contributing factor in their relatively high income status. It is also evident that Samoans and Blacks have the lowest income levels which are far below the various Hawaii medians. The low income rank of Blacks, although they hold a middle range occupational position, is due to their considerable military population. The remaining four ethnic groups appear to have intermediate income rankings with Whites first; however, it is not self evident in what particular order Filipinos, Native Hawaiians and Koreans would be placed.

The only significant change in the relative income ranking of ethnic groups since 1970 is the lower position of Koreans from the top of the scale to an intermediate status in 1980. This lowered rank might be due to continuing immigration from Korea to Hawaii.

Educational Attainment

The disparities in occupational status and income among Hawaii's ethnic groups are also apparent in their differential levels of educational attainment. The 1980 U.S. census data indicate, for persons twenty-five years old and over, Whites have completed the highest median number of years in school (13.3 years) and are followed by Blacks (12.9 years), Chinese (12.8 years), Japanese and Koreans (12.6 years), Native Hawaiians (12.4 years), Filipinos (12.1 years), and Samoans (12.0 years). The median number of years of education for all of Hawaii's residents is quite high (12.7 years). All of the groups increased their median number of years of education completed from 1970 to 1980, but their relative positions remained essentially the same. The greatest advance in educational achievement since 1970 was made by Filipinos whose median number of years of schooling increased by over three years. This increase is due in part to the coming of college educated immigrants from the Philippines (Okamura 1983).

Access to higher education is indicated by the percentage of persons who have had four or more years of college education, again among persons twenty-five years and older. Except for Blacks, who placed fifth, a similar ranking as in the two above measures of educational achievement is apparent: Whites (28.2%), Chinese (27.6%), Japanese (19.8%), Koreans (17.9%), Blacks (14.0%), Filipinos

(10.8%), Native Hawaiians (7.7%), and Samoans (3.3%). Only Whites and Chinese exceed the percentage for Hawaii (20.3%).

An indication of the relative educational statuses of Hawaii's ethnic groups in the near future is given by data on the percentage of twenty and twenty-one year olds who are enrolled in school. In this case, Whites and Blacks, who rank the highest on the first two measures of educational attainment, occupy the last two positions. That is, Chinese are first (62.7%), followed by Japanese (53.9%), Koreans (44.4%), Filipinos (25.3%), Samoans (21.5%), Native Hawaiians (15.9%), Whites (14.5%), and Blacks (8.0%). The percentage for Hawaii is 25.6 percent. The low ranking of Whites and Blacks is probably due to the substantial military segment of their populations.

In sum, with the exception of our last measure of educational attainment, the rank order of ethnic groups that emerges is very similar to that for occupational status. Chinese have the highest overall level of educational achievement as evident in their consistent position above the median education levels for Hawaii residents. Whites also occupy a high educational status because of their above median rankings except on the last index of educational attainment. As for the other groups, Blacks, Japanese and Koreans hold an intermediate status, while Native Hawaiians, Filipinos and Samoans have the lowest levels of educational attainment. Since educational achievement can be viewed as a restriction upon employment in the sense that many occupations, particularly in the higher levels of the occupational scale, require a certain degree of educational qualifications, the educational status order gives an indication of the scope and nature of the occupational stratification of ethnic groups in the near future. In short, the relative occupational ranking of Hawaii's ethnic groups is not likely to change significantly unless the overall stratification system undergoes a fundamental change in its structure.

Principles of Stratification

If the occupational status, educational attainment, and income rank orders of ethnic groups in Hawaii are compared with one another, there is an evident congruence among them, particularly between the two former scales which are essentially identical. The consistency of the status rankings indicates that they express underlying principles which regulate status distribution. Hawaii's ethnic groups thus can be ranked in an overall socioeconomic stratification order. Clearly, Chinese occupy the upper levels of this hierarchy due to their consistently high position according to the three socioeconomic status criteria. Whites also have a high social status because of their superior occupational and educational positions and their midrange income rank. Japanese and Koreans hold an intermediate status in the socioeconomic stratification scale because of their general middle level ranking in terms of occupational status and educational attainment, although Japanese have the highest income levels. Blacks also might be placed in an intermediate position due to their midlevel occupational and educational statuses, although they rank low in terms of income. At the lower end of the social stratification scale are Filipinos, Native Hawaiians, and Samoans who rank lowest in terms of occupational and educational statuses, although Filipinos and Native Hawaiians have an intermediate income rank.

Thus, it is evident that differential access to socioeconomic positions still prevails among ethnic groups, and therefore inequality of opportunity and reward is still a fundamental condition of the social status system of Hawaii rather than a "trend toward racial equality" (Lind 1982, 138). Furthermore, this overall socioeconomic stratification order is virtually identical to that for 1970 which had the ethnic groups in the same relative positions (Okamura 1982, 221). This correspondence between the ethnic stratification scales for 1970 and 1980 indicates the salience and analytic validity of the two principles of status allocation specified in the earlier analysis, that is, ascription of status by ethnicity and achievement of status by competition. Because of the minimal degree of change in the relative positions

of ethnic groups in the stratification order, it can be argued that the principle of ethnic ascription is of greater significance in structuring the relative statuses of groups than competitive achievement, at least for the ten year period between 1970 and 1980.

Ethnicity as a regulating principle of stratification has maintained the structure of the stratification system and thereby the relative statuses of ethnic groups. However, it would be more appropriate to state that the privileged ethnic groups have maintained the social status system to their advantage by emphasizing the significance of ethnicity rather than of open competition in status allocation. Ascription of status by ethnicity is the primary factor in the continued disprivileged position of the subordinate ethnic groups in Hawaii rather than their "relative lack of experience or concern with financial success" (Lind 1982, 139). Such ascription of status obviously does not foster their upward status mobility. The absence of upward mobility between 1970 and 1980 signifies that the stratification order is not being regulated primarily by achievement criteria since, if that were the case, there should be more significant status changes among the disprivileged ethnic groups. In short, competitive achievement as an organizing principle of stratification is of decidedly secondary importance compared to ethnic ascription. Insofar as achievement of status by competition is a factor in the stratification system in Hawaii, it promotes individual but not collective upward mobility for members of the subordinate ethnic groups. In contrast, for the privileged ethnic groups, formal competitive achievement legitimates the advantages and benefits they already obtain through ethnic ascription and thus also serves to consolidate their collective dominance in Hawaii.

In my previous discussion of the stratification system of Hawaii, greater significance was given to competitive achievement as a principle of stratification than in the present analysis. This position was due to the obvious progressive changes in social status between 1930 and 1970 of immigrant plantation groups such as Chinese, Japanese and Koreans. However, it was noted the upward social mobility of those groups could be attributed to the requirements of an expanding and changing economy for skilled, technical, and professional workers, particularly in the immediate post-statehood period, and not necessarily to the lessening of social restrictions such as discriminatory employment practices (Okamura 1982, 223). Given the state government's emphasis on expanding the role of the tourism industry in Hawaii's economy, increased economic opportunities can be expected primarily in blue collar occupations such as in construction and service work. Lesser and restricted opportunities in the higher levels of the occupational scale imply the reduced significance of competitive achievement as a means of upward mobility.

Conclusion

The above description and analysis of the stratification system of Hawaii have focused essentially on the economic dimension of status distribution. Another aspect of stratification that was not addressed pertains to its political dimension or differential access to or control of power. While the economic and political stratification orders are interrelated, the latter differs insofar as it is based on indices such as ethnic group percentages of citizens and registered voters, political party affiliations, and number of elected and appointed government officials. Given the rigidity of the socioeconomic stratification order in Hawaii, subordinate ethnic groups such as Native Hawaiians and Filipinos have viewed political processes as a more likely means of status mobility than economic opportunities. Through their own efforts, those groups have sought to advance their social position through community

organizing or by supporting particular political candidates. However, social status advancement through access to political power is a lengthy and arduous process that is made more difficult by the lack of economic resources. The social structure in Hawaii that ultimately emerges is of a stratification system that is very resistant to change, to the detriment of more than one-third of its population.

REFERENCES

Hawaii State Department of Planning and Economic Development. *The State of Hawaii Data Book 1983.* Honolulu: HSDPED, 1983.

Lind, Andrew W. 1982. Race and Ethnic Relations: An Overview. *Social Process in Hawaii* 29:130-150.

Mitchell, J. C. 1974. "Perceptions of Ethnicity and Ethnic Behavior." In *Urban Ethnicity,* edited by Abner Cohen, 1-35. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Okamura, Jonathan Y. 1982. Ethnicity and Ethnic Relations in Hawaii. In *Ethnicity and Interpersonal Interaction: A Cross-Cultural Study,* edited by David Y. H. Wu, 213-235. Singapore: Maruzen Asia.

_____. 1983. *Immigrant Filipino Ethnicity in Honolulu, Hawaii.* Ph.D. diss., University of London.

Smith, M. G. 1975a. "Pre-Industrial Stratificaton Systems." In *Corporations and Society,* edited by M. G. Smith, 133-163. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

_____. 1975b. "Race and Stratification in the Caribbean." In *Corporations and Society,* edited by M. G. Smith, 271-345. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

United States Bureau of the Census. *Census of Population: 1980, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Hawaii.* Washington, D.C.: USBC, 1982.

Jonathan Y. Okamura is a social anthropologist in the School of Public Health of the University of Hawaii. He has conducted field research in Hawaii on Filipino immigrants in Kalihi and on various aspects of ethnicity and ethnic relations.

Jon received his Ph.D. in social anthropology, taught at a Catholic university in Manila and conducted research in the Philippines from 1984 to 1987. Among his research studies was a community based health care project with Hanunoo Mangyans, a highland cultural minority on the island of Mindoro. He also has written on participatory development in the Philippines, Filipino concepts of justice, and Philippine ethnic minority policy.